



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/529,243

03/25/2005

Lauri Loven

3501-1096

8635

466 7590 09/21/2009

YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BUCKINGHAM, KELLYE DEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/21/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/529,243
Filing Date: March 25, 2005
Appellant(s): LOVEN ET AL.

Kellye Buckingham
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 15, 2009 appealing from the
Office action mailed December 12, 2008

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5949772	Sugikawa et al.	9-1999
20020120647	Amano	8/2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugikawa et al. US Patent 5,949,772 in view of Amano 2002/0120647.

Regarding claim 8, Sugikawa et al. teach a method of processing service requests in an information system including a common access point and at least two service sources offering services, said method comprising:

receiving a service request at said access point (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), analyzing said service request at said access point in order to identify a predetermined keyword indicating a service source offering the requested service (column 11, lines 31-34, predetermined service data, i.e. interpret data as a keyword), forwarding said service request to a service source identified in said analysis (column 11, lines 41-65, data processing sections, B, C, D, and E), analyzing said service request at said service source in order to identify the requested service, providing said identified service (column 12, lines 8-23, the control unit analyzes the destination device identification data of the received data), storing, in a memory containing only service requests whose contents are correct (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and

Art Unit: 2165

services, the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that it's correct), said service request if the service request has led to successful identification of the requested service (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services).

However, he does not teach initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified, and repeating said analyzing at the access point and/or service source for the corrected service request.

Amano disclose initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory containing only service requests whose contents are correct (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services, the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that it's correct), (paragraph 1—20, predetermine elements from application data that are recognized that they are incorrectly generated based on the stored application data), if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request , as no service source or no service can be identified, and repeating said analyzing at the access point and/or service source for the corrected service request (paragraph 83, if two values don't match, a check is perform and automatic correction is done, unless its disabled then its processed manually).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 9, Sugikawa et al further teaches a method according to claim 8, wherein the correction of a received service request is carried out by comparing the contents of the received service request with the contents of the stored service requests,

selecting the stored service request which, based on the comparison, is closest to the received service request (column 7, lines 40-46, selecting a communication device based on the request submitted), however, he does not substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request.

Amano disclose a substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request (paragraph 23, replacing the information based on what is recognized by the recognizer).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Art Unit: 2165

Regarding claim 10, Sugikawa et al. teach an information system comprising:
subscriber stations,

at least two service sources providing a respective service to subscriber stations of the system (column 11, lines 41-65, data processing sections, B, C, D, and E), and an access point providing said subscriber stations with access to services offered by said service sources (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), said access point being arranged to analyze a service request received from a subscriber station in order to identify a predetermined keyword indicating the service source offering the requested service (column 11, lines 31-34, predetermined service data, i.e. interpret data as a keyword), and to forward said service request to the service source offering said service (column 11, lines 41-65, data processing sections, B, C, D, and E), said service sources being connected to the access point in order to receive a service request forwarded by said access point (column 6, lines 61-64, having access to the service request), and arranged to analyze a received service request in order to identify the requested service and to provide the subscriber station with the requested service, said system further comprising: a memory for storing only service requests which have led to successful identification of the requested service and whose contents are correct (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services, the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that its correct).

However, Sugikawa et al. does not teach an error correction device arranged to correct a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified, wherein said access point is arranged to process the corrected service request by carrying out said analyzing and forwarding to a service source, and said service sources are arranged to carry out said analyzing in order to identify the requested service and to provide the service to the subscriber station having transmitted the service request, when receiving such a corrected service request.

Amano disclose an error correction device arranged to correct a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory (paragraph 1—20, predetermine elements from application data that are recognized that they are incorrectly generated based on the stored application data), if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified (paragraph 83, if two values don't match, a check is perform and automatic correction is done, unless its disabled then its processed manually), wherein said access point is arranged to process the corrected service request by carrying out said analyzing and forwarding to a service source (paragraph 14, correcting errors that are recognized to be incorrect based on the predetermine input data), and said service sources are arranged to carry out said analyzing in order to identify the requested service (paragraph 14, correcting errors that are recognized to be incorrect based on the predetermine input data)and to provide the

Art Unit: 2165

service to the subscriber station having transmitted the service request, when receiving such a corrected service request (paragraph 65, transmitted the electronic data based on the service request).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 11, Sugikawa et al. further teach an information system according to claim 10, wherein said error correcting device is arranged to compare the contents of the received service request with the contents of the service requests stored in said memory (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services), to select the stored service request which, based on the comparison, is closest to the received service request (column 7, lines 40-46, selecting a communication device based on the request submitted), however, he does not teach to substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request.

Amano disclose a substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request (paragraph 23, replacing the information based on what is recognized by the recognizer).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et

Art Unit: 2165

al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 12, Sugikawa et al. further teach an information system according to claim 10, wherein said access point is connected to a mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device, i.e. examiner interprets communication device to be a mobile communication device), said subscriber stations are subscriber stations of the mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), and the service requests are messages transmitted with said subscriber stations via the mobile communication system to the access point (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device).

Regarding claim 13, Sugikawa et al. further teach an information system according to claim 11, wherein said access point is connected to a mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), said subscriber stations are subscriber stations of the mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any

Art Unit: 2165

communication device), and the service requests are messages transmitted with said subscriber stations via the mobile communication system to the access point (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device).

Regarding claim 14, Sugikawa further teach an information system according to claim 10, wherein at least one of said service sources provides a service involving transmission of data to a subscriber station which has transmitted a service request (column 7, lines 16-33, communication device that transmit service request), said service source comprising a database containing data (column 9, lines 20-23, memory that stores documentary and diagrammatic output data), and that said service source is arranged to analyze a received service request in order to identify the requested service, to retrieve, from said database (column 12, lines 8-23, the control unit analyzes the destination device identification data of the received data), data associated with the identified service request, and to transmit said retrieved data via said information system to said subscriber station request (column 7, lines 16-33, communication device that transmit service request).

Regarding claim 15, Sugikawa et al. teach error correction device arranged to correct a received service request by utilizing information stored in a memory, containing only service requests whose contents are correct the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that its correct, said error correction device is arranged to

receive and store, in said memory, service requests which have led to successful identification of the requested service (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services), however, he does not teach correct the contents of a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory, and transmit said corrected service request for further processing.

Amano disclose correcting the contents of a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory (paragraph 1- 20, predetermine elements from application data that are recognized that they are incorrectly generated based on the stored application data and (paragraph 14, correction is made based on the application data written in a markup description language), and transmit said corrected service request for further processing (paragraph 108, transmit to another user via multiple intermediates (systems and persons).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 16, Sugikawa et al. the method according to claim 8, wherein the keyword is a user entered search term (col. 36, lines 40-63, input data that is entered by a input means, i.e keyboard, mouse, pen or the like).

Regarding claim 17, Sugikawa et al. teach the method according to claim 8, however he does not teach wherein the requested service is human perceivable data.

Amano disclose wherein the requested service is human perceivable data (paragraph 108; transmit to another user via multiple intermediates (systems and persons)).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

(10) Response to Argument

With respect to claim 8:

Appellants argues that the Sugikawa et al. reference does not teach forwarding said service request to a service source identified in said analysis.

In response to Appellant's argument, Sugikawa et al. disclose in col. 12, lines 16-29 which indicate the communication control unit analyzes the destination device identification data of the received data. In this example, all the devices are destinations (i.e. destination devices) and, therefore, the data indicated by the packet length is read from the reception buffer (and accordingly forwarded). The communication control unit 410 compares the data in the data section of the packet with said predetermined service request data (i.e. forwarding of the service request). Where an agreement is found, the service request is notified to the controller unit 402 (cf. step 32 w2 in FIG. 2). The controller unit 402 examines the address. When all the devices are destinations, the

Art Unit: 2165

controller unit 402 judges whether the device of its own can provide the service (cf. Step w3 in FIG. 2).

With respect to claim 9:

Appellant's argues that the combined references Sugikawa et al. and Amano does not teach substituting at least part of the contents of the received service request with at least part of the contents of the selected service request.

In response to appellant's argument, the combined references disclose the subject matter in the claim language. Although Amano is not specific to the service request data, data is data and the error correction is applicable and necessary of any data type. One of ordinary skill in the art would know how to apply error correction code to service request data because such differences in how to apply error correction to differing types of data would be know to one of ordinary skill in the art, the main reference Sugikawa et al. teach the service request as specified in the previous claim 8.

With respect to claim 10 and 15:

Appellant's argument are directed to the systems claims which are of different type statutory categories, however, reciting similar features as in claim 8, therefore the response to argument to the independent claim 8 apply likewise to claims 10 and 15.

The appellant's mentions the claims are similar to claim 8, therefore the rejection for claim 10 and 15 are similar and are likewise maintained and argued.

Art Unit: 2165

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/KELLYE D BUCKINGHAM/

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Conferees:

Neveen Abel-Jalil

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165

James Trujillo

/James Trujillo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2159